

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated February 23, 2009 in which the Examiner objected to claim 12, rejected claims 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and rejected claims 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e).

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for acknowledgement of the claim for foreign priority. However, Applicants respectfully point out that box 12 a 3 should be indicated rather than box 12 a 1.

As indicated above, a minor informality in claim 12 has been corrected. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the objection to claim 12.

As indicated above, claims 14-15 have been amended to be directed to statutory subject matter. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

As indicated above, claims 12-15 have been amended in order to make explicit what is implicit in the claim. The amendment is unrelated to a statutory requirement for patentability.

Claim 12 claims an information process apparatus, claim 13 claims an information process method, claim 14 claims a program for a process that controls an information process apparatus and claim 15 claims a computer-readable medium. The apparatus, method, program and medium include generating reproduction history information, each composed of (a) identification information of reproduced material data, (b) information about a reproduction end position and (c) information about a reproduction method. The reproduction method includes at least one of a tape-like reproduction method that successively reproduces all clips recorded on the recording medium, a clip designation reproduction method that reproduces a designated clip and an edit list designation reproduction method that reproduces a designated unit of an edit list.

By having each reproduction history information include information about a reproduction method including a tape-like reproduction method, a clip designation reproduction method, and an edit list designation reproduction method as claimed in claims 12-15, the claimed invention provides an information processing apparatus, method, program and medium which can record a reproduction history of various types of reproduction methods for material data on the disks, use the reproduction history in the next reproduction process and resume the reproduction from the last reproduction stop position. The prior art does not show, teach or suggest recording a reproduction history of various types of reproduction methods as claimed in claims 12-15.

Claims 12-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by *Kikuchi, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,532,334).

Kikuchi, et al. appears to disclose a playback interrupt information table 124 of Figure 6 which is a table in which playback interruption information is to be written when a user interrupts the playback. As shown in Figure 9, the table 124 includes the time of the interruption, the title number of the title whose playback has been interrupted, the part of the title number at which the playback has been interrupted, the PGC (program chain information table) number at which the playback has been interrupted, the program number in the PGC whose playback has been interrupted, the cell ID, the ID of the video object unit. When the playback picture is a still picture, the time the still picture lasts and the remaining time of the still picture during the interruption of the playback are written. In addition, the lapsed time in reproducing a cell is written as interrupt information (column 11, lines 24-67).

Thus, *Kikuchi, et al.* discloses a playback interruption information table containing information about the interruption. However, nothing in *Kikuchi, et al.* shows, teaches or

suggests that each reproduction history information includes information about a reproduction method including at least one of a tape-like reproduction method, a clip designation reproduction method and an edit list designation reproduction method as claimed in claims 12-15. Rather, *Kikuchi, et al.* merely discloses recording the time, title number, part of the title number, program chain information table number, program number in the program chain information table, cell ID, the ID of the video object unit and the remaining time of a still picture.

Since nothing in *Kikuchi, et al.* shows, teaches or suggests that each reproduction history information includes information about a reproduction method including a tape-like reproduction method, a clip designation reproduction method and an edit list designation reproduction method as claimed in claims 12-15, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e).

The prior art of record, which is not relied upon, is acknowledged. The reference taken singularly or in combination does not anticipate or make obvious the claimed invention.

Thus it now appears that the application is in condition for a reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

Frommer Lawrence & Haug LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

Date: May 15, 2009

By: 

Ellen Marcie Emas
Reg. No. 32,131
(202) 292-1530